

Moreover, the only relief plaintiff sought in the complaint was injunctive relief, i.e., to be transferred to a state prison and for the medical and dental needs of state inmates at the jail to be met by the authorities. But since plaintiff has been released from confinement, a transfer to another facility is not feasible. Also, aside from any issue regarding plaintiff's standing to assert the rights of others prisoners, meeting the needs of state inmates housed in the Hawkins County jail would provide *him* no benefit because he is not presently confined in that institution and there is no indication that he will be imprisoned in there in the future. *See City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 102 (1983) (noting that "[p]ast exposure to illegal conduct does not in itself show a present case or controversy regarding injunctive relief ... if unaccompanied by any continuing, present adverse effects") (quoting *O'Shea v. Littleton*, 414 U.S. 488, 495-96 (1974)).

Thus, this action solely for injunctive relief would be **MOOT**, even if plaintiff had notified the Court of his new address. *See Kensu v. Haigh*, 87 F.3d 172, 175 (6th Cir. 1996).

Accordingly, this action will be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, *sua sponte*, for want of prosecution. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

A separate judgment will enter.

ENTER:

s/J. RONNIE GREER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE